

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

#### In the specification

The specification has been amended to address certain objections discussed below, and to provide literal antecedent basis for certain amendments made in the claims. No new matter is added.

#### Objection to the drawings

The drawings are objected to for failing to show the heat dissipating device made up of units, each composed of two parallel plates 30 and two supporting plates 32 as described in page 4. It is respectfully submitted, however, that while adjacent sections are described comprising two parallel plates 30 and two supporting plates 32 to clarify the structure of the heat dissipating unit, these units are not said to be separate from one another. Instead, any two adjacent supporting plates 32 and parallel plates 30 can be conceptually construed as a unit, or a section of the heat dissipating device. The specification has been amended to refer to "adjacent sections of the heat dissipating device" instead of "each unit of the heat dissipating device" in order to eliminate confusion regarding a "unit." Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Figure 4 is objected to because it does not appear to be a sectional view of the embodiment of Figure 5. The specification has been amended to refer to Figure 5 now as "a perspective view of the heat-dissipating device according to another embodiment of the present invention," instead of "a perspective view of the heat-dissipating device shown in Fig. 4." In view of this amendment, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings are further objected to as not illustrating the first and second connecting members. As discussed below in reference to the rejection of claim 3 as

indefinite, it is respectfully submitted that the first and second connecting members are clearly depicted in Figs. 3-5. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### Claim objections

Claims 1 and 3 are objected to for certain informalities. These claims have been amended to remove the reference characters "30" and "20" respectively, obviating the present objection. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 1 presently stands rejected as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to describe the invention, and the arrangement of the first and second parts, more clearly and more consistently with the drawings. In view of the amendments to claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 presently stands rejected as being indefinite for claiming subject matter not shown in the drawings. This rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

Claim 3 has been cancelled, and the subject matter of claim 3 incorporated into claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that recited elements of claim 3 (the first and second connecting members, now incorporated into claim 1) are clearly shown in the drawings. The first connecting members 24 and the second connecting members 26 are clearly apparent with reference to Figs. 3-5. The first connecting members 24 are depicted on Fig. 4 extending horizontally near the bottom end of each *vertical* "first part" 20. Again referring to Fig. 4, the first connecting members 24 extend through connecting members 26, which according to Fig. 4 are slots formed near the bottom end of each *slanted* "first part" 20. This arrangement can be seen in Figs. 3 and 5, which show a first connecting member 24 extending through a second connecting member 26. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 presently stand rejected as being indefinite, because they depend from themselves. These claims have been amended to correct their dependencies. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 6 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Haushalter (U.S. 4,926,935). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations previously recited in claim 3, wherein at least one first connecting member is disposed on a first part at the end distal to one end of an adjacent second part, and a second connecting member which is disposed on a corresponding position of another first part at the end distal to another end of the adjacent second part, wherein the first and second connection members are respectively disposed on the corresponding positions of the ends of any two adjacent first parts for connecting the ends of the two first parts together.

What is described by the amended claim 1 is a structure having plural triangular (or parallelogram) sections defined by adjacent first and second sections. Looking at a single second section at the top of the heat-dissipating device (as shown in Fig. 3, for example), it can be seen that adjacent first parts extend downward from opposite edges of the second part to form, and enclose, a triangular region. First and second connecting members are disposed respectively at bottom edges (as illustrated) of the first parts such that the first parts are connected together by interlocking a first connecting member 24 through a second connecting member 26.

It is respectfully submitted that Haushalter fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 1 of the present application, because Haushalter fails to disclose or suggest the first and second connecting members. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 3 presently stands rejected as being unpatentable over Haushalter in view of Lai (U.S. 2005/0056398). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations previously recited in claim 3, and claim 3 has been cancelled accordingly.

With respect to the amended claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Haushalter in view of Lai fails to disclose or suggest all the claim limitations of amended claim 1.

As discussed above, claim 1 recites a particular structure (in a heat-dissipating device formed from a single sheet to form a plurality of first and second parts) including first and second connecting members which cooperate to join edges of the first parts together into triangular sections of the heat-dissipating device. In contrast, Lai discloses a stackable heat sink structure composed of separate, joinable heat sink members.

Lai discloses each heat sink structure, or heat dissipation plate 1, as having a bottom plate 11 and two side plates 12. The side plates 12 are fastened to side plates 12 of another, separate heat dissipating plate. In contrast, according to claim 1 of the present application, first parts that extend from a single second part (or “side plates” extending from a single “bottom plate” in the terminology of Lai) are ***joined together*** at edges distal from the second part, forming a triangular section of the heat-dissipating device.

Lai provides no teaching or suggestion that edges of the side plates 12 distal from the bottom plate 11 are joined together. Instead, the side plates 12 are joined to corresponding side plates 12 of another, separate heat dissipating plate 1. Therefore, the teachings of Lai cannot be combined with the teachings of Haushalter to arrive at the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, if the edges of the side plates 12 distal from the bottom plate 11 are joined together, thereby necessarily resulting in a triangular structure, the separate heat dissipating plates 1 could not be joined as taught by Lai because the distal edges of the side plates 12, being brought together at the apex of the triangle, would

not be aligned with the edges of the bottom plate 11 for stacking of the heat dissipating plates 1.

It is respectfully submitted that, for at least these reasons, Haushalter cannot be combined with Lai to form a prima facie case of obviousness of the subject matter of claim 3, now reflected in amended claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, and 8 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Haushalter, and claims 4 and 5 are rejected as being unpatentable over Haushalter in view of Lee. These rejections are respectfully traversed on the grounds that neither Haushalter, nor Haushalter in view of Lee, address the shortcomings of Haushalter with respect to amended claim 1 as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1, 2, and 4-8 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Application No.: 10/761,196  
Examiner: B. I. Chandran  
Art Unit: 2835

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: January 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Schaefer", written in a cursive style.

JOHN R. SCHAEFER  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,921